



*Creating Integrated Solutions
Since 1888*
www.rochestermidland.com

Corporate Headquarters
333 Hollenbeck Street
Rochester NY 14621

Tel: 585 336-2200
Fax: 585 467-4406

January 6, 2010

Craig Whitenack, Civil Investigator
United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region IX, Southern California Field Office
600 Wilshire Avenue, Suite 1420
Los Angeles, California 90017

**Re: Yosemite Creek Superfund Site, San Francisco, CA
Response to 104(e) Information Request**

This letter responds to the October 15, 2009 request for information ("RFI") of the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") to Rochester Midland Corporation (for Bytech Chemical) ("RMC") with regard to the Yosemite Creek Superfund site (the "Site"). Subject to both the general and specific objections noted below, and without waiving these or other available objections or privileges, RMC submits the following in response to the RFI and in accordance with the January 11, 2010 due date that EPA has established for this response.

In responding to the RFI, RMC has undertaken a diligent and good faith search for, and review of, documents and information in its possession, custody or control and that are relevant to this matter. However, the RFI purports to seek a great deal of information that is not relevant to the Site or alleged contamination at the Site. For example, while we understand the basis of the purported connection between RMC and the former Bay Area Drum State Superfund Site at 1212 Thomas Avenue in San Francisco, California (the "BAD Site"), certain RFI questions seek information regarding facilities other than the BAD Site, including *all* facilities in California and *all* facilities outside California that shipped drums or other containers to *any* location in the entire state of California. These other facilities throughout California and the United States have no nexus to the Site. Because such questions are not relevant to the Site, they are beyond the scope of EPA's authority as set forth in Section 104(e)(2)(A) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act ("CERCLA") (EPA may request information "relevant to . . . [t]he identification, nature, and quantity of materials which have been . . . transported to a . . . facility").

The RFI also defined "COCs" as "any of the contaminants of concern at the Site and includes: lead, zinc, mercury, dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane ("DDT"), chlordane, dieldrin, and polychlorinated biphenyls ("PCBs")." However, certain RFI requests also seek information regarding hazardous substances more broadly. These requests go beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and are not relevant to the Site pursuant to Section 104(e)(2)(A) of CERCLA; thus RMC has limited its review of documents and information to the COCs identified by EPA.

As you know, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control ("DTSC") conducted an extensive investigation of the BAD Site and RMC's operations in connection with it. DTSC's investigation included an information request to RMC and the DTSC files include RMC's Response to DTSC's information request, among other documents. We understand that EPA is already in possession of DTSC's files regarding the BAD Site, and to the extent that EPA

is not in possession of these files, they are readily available to EPA. Thus, the focus of RMC's identification, review and retrieval of documents has been upon data that has not been previously provided to EPA, DTSC or any other governmental agency that is relevant to the Site.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

RMC asserts the following general privileges, protections and objections with respect to the RFI and each information request therein.

1. RMC asserts all privileges and protections it has in regard to the documents and other information sought by EPA, including the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work product doctrine, all privileges and protections related to materials generated in anticipation of litigation, the settlement communication protection, the confidential business information ("CBI") and trade secret protections, and any other privilege or protection available to it under law. In the event that a privileged or protected document has been inadvertently included among the documents produced in response to the RFI, RMC asks that any such document be returned to RMC immediately and here states for the record that it is not thereby waiving any available privilege or protection as to any such document.
2. In the event that a document containing CBI or trade secrets has been inadvertently provided in response to the RFI, RMC asks that any such documents be returned to RMC immediately so that RMC may resubmit the document in accordance with the applicable requirements for the submission of Confidential Information.
3. RMC objects to any requirement to produce documents or information already in the possession of a government agency, including but not limited to DTSC, or already in the public domain. As noted above, DTSC conducted an extensive investigation of the BAD Site and RMC's operations in connection with it. DTSC's investigation included an information request to RMC and the DTSC files include RMC's Response to DTSC's information request. EPA is already in possession of DTSC's files regarding the BAD Site, and to the extent that EPA is not in possession of these files, they are readily available to EPA. Notwithstanding this objection, and without waiving it, RMC may produce certain information or documents in its possession, custody, or control that it previously provided to or obtained from government agencies that contain information responsive to the RFI.
4. RMC objects to Instruction 4 to the extent it seeks to require RMC, if information responsive to the RFI is not in its possession, custody, or control, to identify any and all persons from whom such information "may be obtained." RMC is aware of no obligation that it has under Section 104(e) of CERCLA to identify all other persons who may have information responsive to EPA information requests and is not otherwise in a position to identify all such persons who may have such information.
5. RMC objects to Instruction 5 on the ground that EPA has no authority to impose a continuing obligation on RMC to supplement these responses. RMC will, of course, comply with any lawful future requests that are within EPA's authority.

6. RMC objects to Instruction 6 in that it purports to require RMC to seek and collect information and documents in the possession, custody or control of individuals not within the custody or control of RMC. EPA lacks the authority to require RMC to seek information not in its possession, custody or control.

7. RMC objects to the RFI's definition of "document" or "documents" in Definition 3 to the extent it extends to documents not in RMC's possession, custody, or control. RMC disclaims any responsibility to search for, locate, and provide EPA copies of any documents "known [by RMC] to exist" but not in RMC's possession, custody, or control.

8. RMC objects to the RFI's definition of "Facility" or "Facilities" in Definition 4 because the terms are overbroad to the extent that they extend to facilities with no connection to either the Site or the BAD Site. Moreover, the term "Facilities" as defined in the RFI is confusing and unintelligible as the term is defined as having separate meanings in Definition 4 and Request No. 3.

9. RMC objects to the definition of "identify" in Definition 7 to the extent that the definition encompasses home addresses of natural persons. RMC requests that any contacts with RMC employees identified in these responses or the related documents be initiated through Ronald G. Hull, Senior Counsel, Underberg & Kessler, 300 Bausch & Lomb Place, Rochester, New York 14604.

10. RMC objects to the definition of "you," "Respondent," and "RMC" in Definition 14 because the terms are overbroad and it is not possible for RMC to answer questions on behalf of all the persons and entities identified therein. Notwithstanding this objection, and without waiving it, RMC has undertaken a diligent and good faith effort to locate and furnish documents and information in its possession, custody, and control that are responsive to the RFI.

11. RMC objects to EPA's requests that RMC provide EPA separately information that is contained in documents being furnished by RMC in response to the RFI. Where documents have been provided in connection with a response, information sought by EPA in the corresponding request for information that is set forth in those documents is not furnished separately. To do otherwise would be unduly burdensome.

RESPONSES TO OCTOBER 15, 2009 EPA INFORMATION REQUESTS

1. *Describe generally the nature of the business conducted by Respondent and identify the products manufactured, formulated, or prepared by Respondent throughout its history of operations.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. Identifying each of the products manufactured by Bytech prior to 1982, when RMC acquired the assets of Bytech, is not feasible due to the lack of records available. RMC has prepared a listing of chemical products and raw materials that contained a COC, which were in inventory at Bytech in 1982 when RMC acquired the assets of Bytech and the status of those products as of 1988. A copy of that listing is attached as Exhibit 1.

2. *Provide the name (or other identifier) and address of any facilities where Respondent carried out operations between 1940 and 1988 (the "Relevant Time Period") and that:*

- a. *ever shipped drums or other containers to the BAD Site for recycling, cleaning, reuse, disposal, or sale.*
- b. *are/were located in California (excluding locations where ONLY clerical/office work was performed);*
- c. *are/were located outside of California and shipped any drums or other containers to California for recycling, cleaning, reuse, disposal, or sale (for drums and containers that were shipped to California for sale, include in your response only transactions where the drums and containers themselves were an object of the sale, not transactions where the sole object of the sale was useful product contained in a drum or other container).*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. As stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." However, in addition to facilities with a connection to the BAD Site, Request No. 2 purports to also seek information regarding *any* facility located in California (excluding locations where ONLY clerical/office work was performed) and *any* facility located outside of California that shipped drums or other containers to *any* location in California, even to locations other than the BAD Site. These other facilities have no nexus with the BAD Site, and thus this request seeks information that is not relevant to the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, RMC is providing EPA with certain information related to RMC's Facility that allegedly shipped drums or other containers to the BAD Site.

RMC has no information or documents that contain information related to the shipment of drums or other containers to the BAD Site from any RMC Facility. In 1992 RMC was provided copies of records from the BAD investigation which purport to document that RMC or its predecessor shipped approximately 834 drums to the BAD Site from the Bytech facility in Oakland that RMC acquired in 1982. RMC understands that EPA is already in possession of

DTSC's files regarding the BAD Site, and to the extent that EPA is not in possession of these files, they are readily available to EPA.

3. *Provide a brief description of the nature of Respondent's operations at each Facility identified in your response to Question 2 (the "Facilities") including:*

- a. *the date such operations commenced and concluded; and*
- b. *the types of work performed at each location over time, including but not limited to the industrial, chemical, or institutional processes undertaken at each location.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. In particular, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing objection, RMC objects to the request in (b.) that it describe "types of work performed at each location over time" Without an identification by EPA of the types of work it is referring to, it would be virtually impossible, given the broad nature of possible work at various facilities, to describe each and every type of work that was performed at any facility. To the extent that EPA seeks information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, RMC is providing EPA with certain information related to the RMC Facility that allegedly shipped drums or other containers to the BAD Site.

The Bytech facility manufactured and warehoused cleaning products during the relevant time period.

4. *For each Facility, describe the types of records regarding the storage, production, purchasing, and use of Substances of Interest ("SOI") during the Relevant Time Period that still exist and the periods of time covered by each type of record.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks to require RMC to describe "types of records." RMC further objects to Request No. 4 as it purports to seek information relating to hazardous substances beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and that is not relevant to the Site; thus RMC has limited its review of documents and information to the COCs identified by EPA.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, RMC is providing EPA with certain information and documents that contain information related to RMC's Facility that allegedly shipped drums or other containers to the BAD Site.

RMC has prepared a listing of chemical products and raw materials that contained a COC, which were in inventory at Bytech in 1982 when RMC acquired the assets of Bytech and the status of those products as of 1988. A copy of that listing is attached as Exhibit 1. RMC has no information or documents other than records provided to it as part of the BAD investigation (See Response No. 2) that contain information related to the shipment of drums or other containers to the BAD Site from Bytech or any other RMC Facilities.

5. *Did Respondent ever (not just during the Relevant Time Period) produce, purchase, use, or store one of the COCs (including any substances or wastes containing the COCs) at any of the Facilities? State the factual basis for your response.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. By removing any temporal limit and any nexus between COCs at RMC's Facilities and the BAD Site, Request No. 5 purports to seek information relating to RMC's Facilities that is not relevant to contamination at the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiver of its objections, RMC refers EPA to its Response No. 1 and Exhibit 1 attached hereto.

6. *If the answer to Question 5 is yes, identify each COC produced, purchased, used, or stored at each Facility.*

RESPONSE:

See Exhibit 1.

7. *If the answer to Question 5 is yes, identify the time period during which each COC was produced, purchased, used, or stored at each Facility.*

RESPONSE:

The COCs identified in Exhibit 1 were used from 1982 or earlier to the end of the Relevant Time Period.

8. *If the answer to Question 5 is yes, identify the average annual quantity of each COC produced, purchased, used, or stored at each Facility.*

RESPONSE:

RMC has no records for the relevant time period showing the average annual quantity of each COC produced, purchased, used or stored at the Facility.

9. *If the answer to Question 5 is yes, identify the volume of each COC disposed by the Facility annually and describe the method and location of disposal.*

RESPONSE:

RMC has no records for the relevant time period showing the average annual quantity of each COC produced, purchased, used or stored at the Facility.

10. *Did Respondent ever (not just during the Relevant Time Period) produce, purchase, use, or store hydraulic oil or transformer oil at any of the Facilities? State the factual basis for your response to this question.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. By removing any temporal limit and any nexus between hydraulic fuel or transformer oil at RMC's Facilities and the BAD Site, Request No. 10 purports to seek information relating to RMC's Facilities that is not relevant to contamination at the Site.

11. *If the answer to Question 10 is yes, identify each specific type of hydraulic oil and transformer oil produced, purchased, used, or stored at each Facility.*

RESPONSE:

See Response No. 10.

12. *If the answer to Question 10 is yes, identify the time period during which each type of hydraulic oil and transformer oil was produced, purchased, used, or stored.*

RESPONSE:

See Response No. 10.

13. *If the answer to Question 10 is yes, identify the average annual quantity of each type hydraulic oil and transformer oil purchased, produced, used, or stored at each Facility.*

RESPONSE:

See Response No. 10.

14. *If the answer to Question 10 is yes, identify the volume of each hydraulic oil and transformer oil disposed by the Facility annually and describe the method and location of disposal.*

RESPONSE:

See Response No. 10.

15. *Provide the following information for each SOI (SOIs include any substance or waste containing the SOI) identified in your responses to Questions 5 and 10:*

- a. *Describe briefly the purpose for which each SOI was used at the Facility. If there was more than one use, describe each use and the time period for each use;*
- b. *Identify the supplier(s) of the SOIs and the time period during which they supplied the SOIs, and provide copies of all contracts, service orders, shipping manifests, invoices, receipts, canceled checks and other documents pertaining to the procurement of the SOI;*
- c. *State whether the SOIs were delivered to the Facility in bulk or in closed containers, and describe any changes in the method of delivery over time;*
- d. *Describe how, where, when, and by whom the containers used to store the SOIs (or in which the SOIs were purchased) were cleaned, removed from the Facility, and/or disposed of, and describe any changes in cleaning, removal, or disposal practices over time.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. Request No. 15 purports to seek information relating to RMC's Facilities that is not relevant to contamination at the Site.

16. *For each SOI delivered to the Facilities in closed containers, describe the containers, including but not limited to:*

- a. *the type of container (e.g. 55 gal. drum, tote, etc.);*
- b. *whether the containers were new or used; and*
- c. *if the containers were used, a description of the prior use of the container.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. Request No. 16 purports to seek information relating to RMC's Facilities that is not relevant to contamination at the Site.

17. *For each container that Respondent used to store a SOI or in which SOIs were purchased ("Substance-Holding Containers" or "SHCs") that was later removed from the Facility, provide a complete description of where the SHCs were sent and the circumstances under which the SHCs were removed from the Facility. Distinguish between the Relevant Time Period and the time period since 1988, and describe any changes in Respondent's practices over time.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. RMC further objects to Request No. 17 as it assumes that each SHC is somehow individually identified, tracked, and used and reused by the same entity throughout the life of the SHC. There is no evidence that BAD operated in this way or that it tracked SHCs for its customers such that this information is available. Generally, SHCs, such as drums sent to drum reconditioners by a customer, are fungible commodities and are not individually tagged or tracked to ensure their return to that particular customer. Accordingly, Request No. 17 purports to seek information that does not exist.

RMC further objects to Request No. 17 as it purports to seek information relating to hazardous substances beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and that is not relevant to the Site; thus RMC has limited its review of documents and information to the COCs identified by EPA.

Additionally, as stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." However, Request No. 17 purports to seek information regarding SHCs that were sent to sites other than the BAD Site. To the extent that EPA seeks information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, RMC has no information or documents that contain information related to the shipment of drums or other containers to the BAD Site from Bytech other than the records provided in 1992 (See Response No. 2) and no information or documents related to other RMC Facilities.

18. *For each SHC that was removed from the Facility, describe Respondent's contracts, agreements, or other arrangements under which SHCs were removed from the Facility, and identify all parties to each contract, agreement, or other arrangement described. Distinguish between the Relevant Time Period and the time period since 1988.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. As stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." However, Request No. 18 purports to seek information regarding SHCs that were sent to sites other than the BAD Site. To the extent that EPA seeks information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, RMC has no information or documents that contain information related to the shipment of drums or other containers to the BAD Site from Bytech other than the records provided in 1992 (See Response No. 2) and no information or documents related to other RMC Facilities

19. *For each SHC, provide a complete explanation regarding the ownership of the SHC prior to delivery, while onsite, and after it was removed from the Facility. Distinguish between the Relevant Time Period and the time period since 1988, and describe any changes in Respondent's practices over time.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. RMC further objects to Request No. 19 as it assumes that each SHC is somehow individually identified, tracked, and used and reused by the same entity throughout the life of the SHC. There is no evidence that BAD operated in this way or that it tracked SHCs for its customers such that this information is available. Generally, SHCs, such as drums sent to drum reconditioners by a customer, are fungible commodities and are not individually tagged or tracked to ensure their return to that particular customer. Accordingly, Request No. 19 purports to seek information that does not exist. As stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." However, Request No. 18 purports to seek information regarding SHCs that were sent to sites other than the BAD Site.

20. *Identify all individuals who currently have, and those who have had, responsibility for procurement of Materials at the Facilities. Also provide each individual's job title, duties, dates performing those duties, current position or the date of the individual's resignation, and the nature of the information possessed by each individual concerning Respondent's procurement of Materials.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. Request No. 20 purports to seek information relating to RMC's Facilities that is not relevant to contamination at the Site. RMC further objects to Request No. 20 as it purports to seek information regarding procurement of "Materials" at facilities other than the BAD Site and thus goes beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment.

21. *Describe how each type of waste containing any SOIs was collected and stored at the Facilities prior to disposal/recycling/sale/transport, including:*

- a. *the type of container in which each type of waste was placed/stored;*
- b. *how frequently each type of waste was removed from the Facility; Distinguish between the Relevant Time Period and the time period since 1988, and describe any changes in Respondent's practices over time.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. As stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." However, Request No. 21 purports to seek information regarding collection and storage of "any SOIs" at facilities other than the BAD Site. To the extent that EPA seeks information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site.

22. *Describe the containers used to remove each type of waste containing any SOIs from the Facilities, including but not limited to:*

- a. *the type of container (e.g. 55 gal. drum, dumpster, etc.);*
- b. *the colors of the containers;*
- c. *any distinctive stripes or other markings on those containers;*
- d. *any labels or writing on those containers (including the content of those labels);*
- e. *whether those containers were new or used; and*
- f. *if those containers were used, a description of the prior use of the container;*

Distinguish between the Relevant Time Period and the time period since 1988, and describe any changes in Respondent's practices over time.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. RMC further objects to Request No. 22 as it assumes that each SHC is somehow individually identified, tracked, and used and reused by the same entity throughout the life of the SHC. There is no evidence that BAD operated in this way or that it tracked SHCs for its customers such that this information is available. Generally, SHCs, such as drums sent to drum reconditioners by a customer, are fungible commodities and are not individually tagged or tracked to ensure their return to that particular customer. Accordingly, Request No. 22 purports to seek information that does not exist.

As stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." Moreover, the RFI defined "COCs" as "any of the contaminants of concern at the Site and includes: lead, zinc, mercury, DDT, chlordane, dieldrin, and PCBs. RMC further objects to Request No. 22 as it purports to seek information relating to hazardous substances beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and that is not relevant to the Site; thus, RMC has limited its review of documents and information to the COCs identified by EPA. Additionally, RMC objects to Request No. 22 as it purports to seek information regarding containers used to remove each type of waste containing any SOIs from the Facilities and taken to *any* other place during *any* time. To the extent that EPA seeks information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, RMC has no information or documents that contain information related to the shipment of drums or other containers to the BAD Site from Bytech other than the records provided in 1992 (See Response No. 2) and no information or documents related to other RMC Facilities

23. *For each type of waste generated at the Facilities that contained any of the SOIs, describe Respondent's contracts, agreements, or other arrangements for its disposal, treatment, or recycling and identify all parties to each contract, agreement, or other arrangement described. State the ownership of waste containers as specified under each contract, agreement, or other arrangement described and the ultimate destination or use for such containers. Distinguish between the Relevant Time Period and the time period since 1988, and describe any changes in Respondent's practices over time.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. As stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to

contamination at the Site.” Moreover, the RFI defined “COCs” as “any of the contaminants of concern at the Site and includes: lead, zinc, mercury, DDT, chlordane, dieldrin, and PCBs. RMC further objects to Request No. 23 as it purports to seek information relating to hazardous substances beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and that is not relevant to the Site; thus, RMC has limited its review of documents and information to the COCs identified by EPA. Additionally, RMC objects to Request No. 23 as it purports to seek information regarding waste generated at any Facilities that contained any SOIs and taken to *any* other place during *any* time. To the extent that EPA seeks information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site.

24. *Identify all individuals who currently have, and those who have had, responsibility for Respondent's environmental matters (including responsibility for the disposal, treatment, storage, recycling, or sale of Respondent's wastes and SHCs). Provide the job title, duties, dates performing those duties, supervisors for those duties, current position or the date of the individual's resignation, and the nature of the information possessed by such individuals concerning Respondent's waste management.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. Identifying all individuals who currently have, and those who have had, responsibility for RMC’s environmental matters at all of RMC’s Facilities, including those that have no nexus to the BAD Site, is not relevant and unduly burdensome.

25. *Did Respondent ever purchase drums or other containers from a drum recycler or drum reconditioner? If yes, identify the entities or individuals from which Respondent acquired such drums or containers.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. Identifying all drum recyclers or drum reconditioners from which RMC has ever acquired such drums or containers is not feasible due to its long history of existence/operations, the number of RMC’s locations, and the lack of records available.

26. *Prior to 1988, did Respondent always keep its waste streams that contained SOIs separate from its other waste streams?*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. RMC further objects to Request No. 26 as it purports to seek information relating to hazardous substances beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and that is not relevant to the Site; thus, RMC has limited its review of documents and information to the COCs identified by EPA.

27. *Identify all removal and remedial actions conducted pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. § 9601 et seq., or comparable state law; all corrective actions conducted pursuant to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. § 6901 et seq.; and all cleanups conducted pursuant to the Toxic Substances Control Act, 15 U.S.C. § 2601 et seq. where (a) one of the COCs was addressed by the cleanup and (b) at which Respondent paid a portion of cleanup costs or performed work. Provide copies of all correspondence between Respondent and any federal or state government agency that (a) identifies a COC and (b) is related to one of the above-mentioned sites.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. As stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." However, Request No. 27 purports to seek information regarding a broad range of removal and remedial actions, corrective actions and cleanups. Moreover, identifying all such removal and remedial actions is not feasible . . . [due to long history of existence/operations, the number of RMC's locations, etc.]. To the extent that EPA seeks information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site. RMC further objects to Request No. 27 to the extent that EPA is already in possession of the requested documents, and to the extent that EPA is not in possession of these files, they are readily available to EPA.

28. *Provide all records of communication between Respondent and Bay Area Drum Company, Inc.; Meyers Drum Company; A.W. Sorich Bucket and Drum Company; Waymire Drum Company, Inc.; Waymire Drum and Barrel Company, Inc.; Bedini Barrels Inc.; Bedini Steel Drum Corp.; Bedini Drum; or any other person or entity that owned or operated the facility located at 1212 Thomas Avenue, in the City and County of San Francisco, California.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. DTSC conducted an extensive investigation of the BAD Site and RMC's operations in connection with it. DTSC's files include extensive records concerning the Bay Area Drum Company, Inc. and other persons and entities that owned or operated the facility located at 1212 Thomas Avenue, in the City and County of San Francisco, California. RMC understands that

EPA is already in possession of DTSC's files regarding the BAD Site, and to the extent that EPA is not in possession of these files, they are readily available to EPA.

29. *Identify the time periods regarding which Respondent does not have any records regarding the SOLs that were produced, purchased, used, or stored at the Facilities.*

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, RMC objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. In responding to the RFI, RMC has undertaken a diligent and good faith search for, and review of, documents and information in its possession, custody or control and that are relevant to this matter. Moreover, RMC understands that EPA is already in possession of DTSC's files regarding the BAD Site. RMC is under no further obligation to identify time periods to which these documents do not pertain.

30. *Provide copies of all documents containing information responsive to the previous twenty-nine questions and identify the questions to which each document is responsive.*

RESPONSE:

RMC objects to Request No. 30 as it purports to seek information relating to hazardous substances beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and that is not relevant to the Site; thus, RMC has limited its review of documents and information to the COCs identified by EPA. RMC further objects to Request No. 30 as it purports to seek copies of documents containing information responsive to the previous twenty-nine questions. DTSC conducted an extensive investigation of the BAD Site and RMC's operations in connection with it. DTSC's investigation included an information request to RMC and the DTSC files include RMC's Response to DTSC's information request, among other documents. We understand that EPA is already in possession of DTSC's files regarding the BAD Site, and to the extent that EPA is not in possession of these files, they are readily available to EPA.

Any questions EPA may have regarding the responses to these information request may be directed to Ronald G. Hull, Senior Counsel, Underberg & Kessler, 300 Bausch & Lomb Place, Rochester, New York 14604.

ROCHESTER MIDLAND CORPORATION



Michael S. Coyner
President & COO

Exhibit 1 to Rochester Midland Corporation's response to the EPA's Request for Information.

06-Jan-10

Inventory of Bytech products at the time of asset acquisition by Rochester Midland Corporation in 1982.

Bytech Finished Products	Description	Component (Chem #)	COC	% COC In Formula	Inventory In 1-Gallon Containers	Inventory In 5-gallon Pails	Inventory in 55-gallon Drums	Total Inventory in Gallons
Bi-Loc - Bi-Loc continued in the RMC line until at least 1992.	FL FINISH	Chem. 197 - Conlex 4	Zinc	0.42% Zinc	12	0	5	287
Bytech Finish	FL FINISH	Chem. 197 - Conlex 4	Zinc	0.42% Zinc	54	10		104
Con-15 continued in the RMC line until 1994 when it was discontinued.	FL FINISH	Chem. 197 - Conlex 4	Zinc	0.42% Zinc	0	0	0	0
Conlex (Gem) - Conlex (Gem) continued in the RMC line until 1997.	FL FINISH	Chem. 197 - Conlex 4	Zinc	0.42% Zinc	0	335	0	1675
Finale - Finale continued in the RMC line until 1997.	FL FINISH	Chem. 197 - Conlex 4	Zinc	0.42% Zinc	12	0	0	12
Hyhte #1 - Hyhte #1 continued in the RMC line until 1998 when it was discontinued.	FL FINISH	Lead Naphenate	Lead	0.2232% Lead	64	10	0	114
Hyseal - Hyseal continued in the RMC line until 1998 when it was discontinued.	FL FINISH	Lead Naphenate	Lead	0.2232% Lead	0	1	0	5
Hyseal #1 - Hyseal #1 continued in the RMC line until 1998 when it was discontinued.	FL FINISH	Lead Naphenate	Lead	0.144% Lead	63	0	0	63
Prestige - Prestige continued in the RMC line until at least 1992.	FL FINISH	Chem. 279 - Mor Gle 2	Zinc	0.42% Zinc	0	192	0	968
Prestige 26 - Prestige 26 continued in the RMC line until 1998.	FL FINISH	Chem 873 - ICL #10	Zinc	0.55% Zinc	18	98	2	618
Slow Prestige - Slow Prestige continued in the RMC line until at least 1985.	FL FINISH	Chem. 565 - Morphic 16	Zinc	0.45% Zinc	0	6	0	30

Bytech Raw Materials				% COC In Raw Material	Inventory Pounds
Conlex			Zinc	1.30%	7,824
Naphenate Zinc 8%			Zinc	8.00%	41
Nuodex Lead 24%			Lead	24.00%	187
Rhoplex 8924			Zinc	1.30%	1,380